

PLAINTIFF BRIAN WILSON'S 1 **UNCONTROVERTED FACTS:** 2 No. 1: Defendant Aargon Agency, Inc. ("Aargon") is a "debt collector" as defined 3 by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) of the Fair Debt 4 Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA"). 5 6 No. 2: Defendant Duane Christy 7 ("Christy") is a debt collectors as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) of the FDCPA. 8 9 10 11 No. 3: Defendants were retained by Impulse Telecom, a local telephone 4760 SOUTH PECOS ROAD, SUITE 103 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89121 (702) 435-7968 Telecopier (702) 946-0887 12 service provider, concerning an allegedly unpaid account to Mr. Wilson. 13 No. 4: Mr. Wilson is a "consumer" as 14 defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3) of the 15 **FDCPA** 16 17 No. 5: The telephone account upon which Defendants were attempting to collect was 18 primarily incurred for personal, family or household purposes. 19 20 21 22 23 No. 6: Defendants were assigned Mr. Wilson's account on May 25, 2006. (Facts ¶6). 24 25 26 27 28

CRAIG B. FRIEDBERG, ESQ. 4760 SOUTH PECOS ROAD, SUITE 103
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89121
(702) 435-7968 Telecopier (702) 946-0887

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

No. 7: On May 31, 2006, Defendants called Mr. Wilson on the telephone and left a message. The message identified the caller and the collection agency and asked for Mr. Wilson to call back to a telephone number provided in the message.

No. 8: On or about June 1, 2006
Defendants mailed their initial letter to
Mr. Wilson. The letter noted that
Defendants were attempting to collect
\$392.63 which they claimed was overdue
on an account they indicated Mr. Wilson
had with a company called Impulse
Telecom. The letter did not explain what
type of company Impulse Telecom was,
what it did, nor when the alleged account
became past due. There was nothing in
the letter that would have allowed Mr.
Wilson to investigate the legitimacy of the
alleged delinquent account.

No. 9: On June 7, 2006, Mr. Wilson sent a letter to Defendant Aargon disputing the debt, explaining that he was not familiar with a company named Impulse Telecom, and requesting proof that he owed money on the account, including past due invoices and statements, the address to which the Impulse Telecom service was provided, and the original work order that allegedly established service with the company (hereinafter "dispute letter"). He also requested that if the Defendants were unable to provide the information requested, that they remove the account from their file, cease all collection activities against him and to not report any negative information to any credit bureau to which they report.

No. 10: Mr. Wilson sent the dispute letter to Defendants via FedEx Ground, for next day delivery. It was delivered and signed for by Randall McClemy, an Aargon employee, on June 8, 2006.

8

9

CRAIG B. FRIEDBERG, ESO.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

No. 11: On June 8, 2006, Defendants called Mr. Wilson looking to collect on the Impulse Telecom account and left another message on Mr. Wilson's answering machine. The message left was similar to the one left on May 31.

No. 12:1 On June 9, 2006, Mr. Wilson's dispute letter was marked in Defendants' computer system to be scanned in.

No. 12A: For an unknown reason, the letter was not scanned into the computer system until June 13, 2006.

No. 13: On June 12, 2006, four (4) days after Defendants received Mr. Wilson's dispute letter, someone from Defendant Aargon called attempting to collect on the disputed account and left another message on Mr. Wilson's answering machine, similar to the previous two messages left on May 31, 2006 and June 8, 2006. Mr. Wilson was disturbed to receive the telephone call and message from the Defendants because he had not received anything in the mail responding to his dispute letter and he had asked in that letter for Defendants to stop their collection activity until their response was mailed to him.

No. 14: On June 16, 2006, eight (8) days after Defendants received Mr. Wilson's dispute letter, and three (3) days after it was scanned into their computer system, Defendants again called Mr. Wilson attempting to collect on the disputed account and left another message similar to the previous three.

6

8

9

1

2

3

4

5

No. 15: On June 19, 2006, eleven (11) days after Defendants received Mr. Wilson's dispute letter, and six (6) days after it was scanned into their computer system, Defendants again called Mr. Wilson attempting to collect on the disputed account and left another message similar to the previous four.

11

12

13

14

15

16

10

No. 16: On June 22, 2006, fourteen (14) days after Defendants received Mr. Wilson's dispute letter, and nine (9) days after it was scanned into their computer system, Defendants again called Mr. Wilson attempting to collect on the disputed account and left another message similar to the previous five.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No. 17: Upon receiving the fifth telephone collection message from Defendants after Mr. Wilson overnighted his dispute letter, Mr. Wilson had finally had enough of the collection calls from Defendants and called them back in the late afternoon on June 22, 2006. Mr. Wilson advised them that he had sent them, and they had received, his written dispute letter, which they had not answered, that the telephone calls needed to stop and that he was not going to pay them anything until they sent him proof that he owed money to Telecom Impulse. Mr. Wilson was told that the billing records verifying the account would be mailed to him.

26

27

28

25

26

27

28

CRAIG B. FRIEDBERG, ESO.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

No. 18: After the telephone conversation	n
Mr. Wilson had with Defendants on Jun	ϵ
22, 2006, Mr. Wilson still did not receiv	e
anything from the Defendants verifying	
the disputed account, but the telephone	
calls did stop.	

No. 19: On August 12, 2006, Mr. Wilson pulled up his credit reports, and much to his dismay, found that Defendants had placed a derogatory tradeline regarding the Impulse Telecom account with both Experian and TransUnion, even though they had never responded to his dispute letter.

No. 20: It was Defendants practice and procedure at that time to place accounts they were assigned with Experian and TransUnion if no payments were received from the consumer within thirty (30) days of the assignment.

No. 21: Since Mr. Wilson did not pay the disputed account, Defendants sent the information regarding the Impulse Telecom account to Experian and TransUnion no later than August 5, 2006.

No. 22: Defendants did not report the account as disputed when they sent their information to Experian and TransUnion.

No. 23: On August 14, 2006, Mr. Wilson contacted Experian by email and disputed the Defendants' tradeline, telling Experian that Defendants never responded to his written dispute nor his request for details about the disputed account to demonstrate that he owed Impulse Telecom money.

CRAIG B. FRIEDBERG, ESQ.
4760 SOUTH PECOS ROAD, SUITE 103
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89121
(702) 435-7968 Telecopier (702) 946-0887

No 23A: On August 14, 2006, Mr. Wilson contacted TransUnion by email and disputed the Defendants' tradeline, advising TransUnion that Defendants never responded to his written dispute nor his request for details about the disputed account to demonstrate that he owed Impulse Telecom money.

No. 24: On August 20, 2006, Mr. Wilson went to Jared Jewelry to purchase his wife a Rolex watch as a surprise gift and he was denied the 12 month no interest financing deal because of the Defendants' derogatory tradeline on his credit report. He ended up having to have his wife apply for the financing deal, essentially needing to have her involved in buying her own gift.

No. 25: As a result of Mr. Wilson disputing the account with the credit bureaus, Defendants received an automated consumer dispute verification ("ACDV") form on its E-Oscar system, on or about August 31, 2006, from one or both of Experian and TransUnion.

No. 26: Defendants responded to back to Experian and/or TransUnion by (a) verifying the information it had previously supplied them regarding the account was accurate; and (b) did not advise them that Wilson was disputing the account.

No. 27: Both Experian and TransUnion received Defendants' responses verifying the account information and without any notation that Mr. Wilson was disputing the account; and subsequently notified Mr. Wilson that Defendants had verified the account and, therefore, no changes to it would be made.

CRAIG B. FRIEDBERG, ESO.

4760 SOUTH PECOS ROAD, SUITE 103 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89121 (702) 435-7968 Telecopier (702) 946-0887 12 13 16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

No. 28: In September 2006, Mr. Wilson was attempting to refinance his home to use some of the excess equity in the property and use it for home improvements. Because of the Defendants' derogatory account information in his credit reports, Mr. Wilson could not receive the best rates available to him at that time had he not had the negative tradeline.

No. 29: On May 10, 2007, Mr. Wilson filed the instant action, within which, he again reitrates his dispute regarding the subject account. The lawsuit was served on Defendants, through their resident agent on July 6, 2007. Defendants received the actual complaint no later than July 25, 2007.

No. 30: In August 2007, Mr. Wilson, disputed the subject account with Experian and TransUnion a second time. As a result of Mr. Wilson disputing the account with the credit bureaus, Defendants received an automated consumer dispute verification ("ACDV") form on its E-Oscar system, on or about August 31, 2006, from one or both of Experian and TransUnion.

No. 31: Both Experian and TransUnion received Defendants' responses again verifying the account information and without any notation that Mr. Wilson was disputing the account; and subsequently notified Mr. Wilson that Defendants had verified the account and, therefore, no changes to it would be made.

CRAIG B. FRIEDBERG, ESO.

4760 SOUTH PECOS ROAD, SUITE 103 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89121 (702) 435-7968 Telecopier (702) 946-0887

No.32: On February 11, 2008, Mr. Wilson wrote lengthy letters to both Experian and TransUnion explaining his situation and also enclosing the complaint that was filed in this action. The letters were mailed to the CRAs within the next day or two. He received a letter from TransUnion, dated February 19, 2008, stating that it would contact Defendants to advise them of his dispute and would ask Defendants to dispute and would ask Defendants to verify the accuracy of the reported information.

No. 33:

1.